

SHORELINE MASTER PROGRAM PERIODIC REVIEW

Periodic Review Checklist: 2021 version

This document is intended for use by counties, cities and towns subject to the Shoreline Management Act (SMA) to conduct the “periodic review” of their Shoreline Master Programs (SMPs). The review is required under the SMA at [RCW 90.58.080\(4\)](#). Ecology rules that define the procedures for conducting these reviews include a requirement to use this checklist to ensure a successful review ([WAC 173-26-090](#)). By filling out this checklist, the local government is demonstrating compliance with the minimum scope of review requirements of WAC 173-26-090(2)(d)(ii). The checklist is organized into two parts.

Part One is used to identify how the SMP complies with current state laws, rules and guidance. This checklist identifies amendments to state law, rules and applicable updated guidance adopted between 2007 and 2021 that may trigger the need for local SMP amendments.

Part Two is used to document local review to ensure the SMP is consistent with changes to the local comprehensive plans or development regulations, and to consider changes in local circumstances, new information or improved data. As part of this periodic review the local government should include consideration of whether or not the changes warrant an SMP amendment.

How to use this checklist

See the associated *Periodic Review Checklist Guidance* for a description of each item, relevant links, review considerations, and example language.

Use the **review column** to document review considerations and determine if local amendments are needed to maintain compliance. See WAC 173-26-090(3)(b). Ecology recommends reviewing all items on the checklist.

Use the **action column** as a final summary identifying your final action taken to address the identified change in state law, rule or guidance. See WAC 173-26-090(3)(d)(ii)(D), and WAC 173-26-110(9)(b). This will likely include one of the following:

- Amendment proposed (include code citation);
- No amendment needed; or
- Not applicable.

Example

Row	Summary of change	Review	Action
2017a	OFM adjusted the cost threshold for substantial development to \$7,047.	21A.25.290B refers to the statutory thresholds, as amended by OFM.	No amendments needed.

For more information

Coordinate with [Ecology regional planner](#) for more information on how to use this checklist and conduct the periodic review.

Prepared By	Jurisdiction	Date

Part One: State laws, rules and guidance review

Part One is used to demonstrate compliance with WAC 173-26-090(2)(d)(i)(A). This checklist identifies amendments to state law, rules and applicable updated guidance adopted between 2007 and 2021 that may trigger the need for local SMP amendments during periodic reviews.*

Row	Summary of change	Review	Action
2021			
a.	The Legislature amended floating on-water residences provisions		
b.	The Legislature clarified the permit exemption for fish passage projects		
2019			
a.	OFM adjusted the cost threshold for building freshwater docks		
2017			
a.	OFM adjusted the cost threshold for substantial development to \$7,047.		
b.	Ecology permit rules clarified the definition of “development” does not include dismantling or removing structures.		
c.	Ecology adopted rules clarifying exceptions to local review under the SMA.		
d.	Ecology amended rules clarifying permit filing procedures consistent with a 2011 statute.		
e.	Ecology amended forestry use regulations to clarify that forest practices that only involves timber cutting are not SMA “developments” and do not require SDPs.		

Row	Summary of change	Review	Action
f.	Ecology clarified the SMA does not apply to lands under exclusive federal jurisdiction		
g.	Ecology clarified “default” provisions for nonconforming uses and development .		
2016			
a.	The Legislature created a new shoreline permit exemption for retrofitting existing structure to comply with the Americans with Disabilities Act .		
b.	Ecology updated wetlands critical areas guidance including implementation guidance for the 2014 wetlands rating system.		
2015			
a.	The Legislature adopted a 90-day target for local review of Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) projects.		
2012			
a.	The Legislature amended the SMA to clarify SMP appeal procedures .		
2011			
a.	Ecology adopted a rule requiring that wetlands be delineated in accordance with the approved federal wetland delineation manual .		
b.	Ecology adopted rules for new commercial geoduck aquaculture .		
c.	The Legislature created a new definition and policy for floating homes permitted or legally established prior to January 1, 2011.		
d.	The Legislature authorizing a new option to classify existing structures as conforming .		

Row	Summary of change	Review	Action
2010			
a.	The Legislature adopted Growth Management Act – Shoreline Management Act clarifications.		
2009			
a.	The Legislature created new “relief” procedures for instances in which a shoreline restoration project within a UGA creates a shift in Ordinary High Water Mark.		
b.	Ecology adopted a rule for certifying wetland mitigation banks.		
c.	The Legislature added moratoria authority and procedures to the SMA.		
2007			
a.	The Legislature clarified options for defining "floodway" as either the area that has been established in FEMA maps, or the floodway criteria set in the SMA.		
b.	Ecology amended rules to clarify that comprehensively updated SMPs shall include a list and map of streams and lakes that are in shoreline jurisdiction.		

* See additional considerations for Ocean Management within Ecology’s Ocean Management Checklist and associated guidance for using the Ocean Management Checklist. This checklist and guidance summarizes state law, rules and applicable updated information related to Ocean Resources Management Act (ORMA) and the Washington State Marine Spatial Plan (MSP). All jurisdictions with coastal waters must implement ORMA and the MSP applies to all jurisdictions that overlap with the MSP Study Area. Clallam County, Jefferson County, Grays Harbor County, Pacific County, Ilwaco, Long Beach, Raymond, South Bend, Cosmopolis, Ocean Shores, Hoquiam, Aberdeen, Westport need to plan for ocean uses consistent with ORMA and the MSP and should be using the Ocean Management Checklist in addition to this Periodic Review Checklist.

Part Two: Local review amendments

Part Two is used to demonstrate compliance with WAC 173-26-090(2)(d)(ii). This checklist identifies changes to the local comprehensive plans or development regulations, changes in local circumstances, new information or improved data that may warrant an SMP amendment during periodic reviews.

Changes to Comprehensive Plan and Development regulations

Question	Answer		Discussion
Have you had Comprehensive Plan amendments since the SMP comprehensive update that may trigger need for an SMP amendment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	
Have your had Development Regulations amendments since the SMP comprehensive update that may trigger need for an SMP amendment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	
Has your Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO) been updated since the SMP comprehensive update? If yes, are there changes that trigger need for an SMP amendment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	
Are CAO provisions incorporated by reference (with ordinance # and date) into your SMP? If yes, is it the current CAO or a previous version?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	
Has any new shoreline area been annexed into your jurisdiction since your SMP was updated? If yes, were these areas pre-designated?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	
Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	

If your review and evaluation resulted in proposed SMP text or map amendments, please create a table that identifies changes to the SMP for consistency with amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and Development regulations. Example format:

SMP Section	Summary of proposed change	Citation to any applicable RCW or WAC	Rationale for how the amendment complies with SMA or Rules

Changes to local circumstance, new information, or improved data

Question	Answer		Discussion
Has your jurisdiction experienced any significant events, such as channel migration, major floods or landslides that impacted your shoreline and could trigger a need for an SMP amendment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	
Have FEMA floodplain or floodway maps been recently updated for your jurisdiction? If your SMP extends shoreline jurisdiction to the entire 100-year floodplain, has FEMA updated maps that trigger a need for an SMP amendment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	
Have you issued any formal SMP Administrative Interpretations that could lead to improvements in the SMP?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	
Are there any Moratoria in place affecting development in the Shoreline?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	
Have staff identified the need for clarification based on implementation or other changes? e.g., modifications to environment designations, mapping errors, inaccurate internal references.	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	
Are there other changes to local circumstances, new information, or improved data that need to be addressed in your SMP?	<input type="checkbox"/>	Yes	
	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	

If your review and evaluation resulted in proposed SMP text or map amendments, please create a table that identifies changes to the SMP to address changes to local circumstances, new information, or improved data. Example format:

SMP Section	Summary of proposed change	Citation to any applicable RCW or WAC	Rationale for how the amendment complies with SMA or Rules